Israel as the World's Jungian Shadow: Projection, Numinous Geography, and the Politics of Attention

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

September 22, 2025

This article advances a strong thesis: Israel functions as the world's Jungian Shadow—the privileged object onto which diverse societies project disowned material about violence, victimhood, ethnonationalism, and sacrilege. While "a state is not a psyche," collective psychology provides a productive metaphor for explaining otherwise puzzling phenomena: disproportionate global attention to Israel/Palestine relative to structural analogues; oscillations between idealization and demonization; mimetic accusations in which opponents mirror each other's charges; and policy inconsistencies across states and institutions. I argue that Israel's unique stacking of four conditions—sacred geography fused with modern sovereignty, a trauma-to-power inversion, liminal civilizational placement, and dense diasporic entanglement—creates an unusually high archetypal "voltage." This configuration renders the conflict a compact mirror for global contradictions around borders, security, chosenness, and historical guilt. The goal is neither apologia nor exceptionalist indictment, but an analytic account of projection dynamics that clarifies why the conflict persistently exceeds geopolitics. To keep the metaphor disciplined, I pair the Jungian lens with legal and empirical anchors (international humanitarian law, civilian protection metrics, settlement regimes, hostages and detainees, incitement). By distinguishing symbol from specificity, the article shows how recognizing Shadow dynamics can improve moral clarity, reduce purity traps, and support more symmetrical, law-bound scrutiny of all parties.

Keywords: Jungian Shadow, projection, Israel/Palestine, numinosity, sacred geography, victim–perpetrator paradox, ethnonationalism, scapegoating, attention asymmetry, mimetic rivalry, international humanitarian law, diasporic politics, archetype, liminality.

A collaboration with GPT-5. CC4.0. 37 pages.

Outline

1. Introduction: From Geopolitics to Archetype
   1.1 Motivation and scope
   1.2 Metaphor, not metaphysics: limits of collective psychology
2. Conceptual Framework: Shadow, Projection, and Collective Phenomena
   2.1 The Shadow and projective identification
   2.2 From individuals to polities: methodological cautions
3. Why Israel? The Fourfold Overdetermination
   3.1 Sacred geography + modern sovereignty (numinosity and myth)
   3.2 Trauma-to-power inversion (victimhood and hard power)
   3.3 Liminality (East/West, secular/religious, diaspora/homeland)
   3.4 Diasporic entanglement and transnational affect circuits
4. Behavioral Evidence of Shadow Dynamics
   4.1 Attention asymmetry across media, academy, and diplomacy
   4.2 Oscillating idealization/demonization and purity traps
   4.3 Mimetic accusations and mirror rhetoric
   4.4 Policy inconsistency as displacement
5. Case Comparisons and Counterexamples
   5.1 United States, China, Russia: power without numinosity
   5.2 India–Pakistan, Iran, Saudi Arabia: regional mirrors lacking the full stack
6. Guardrails and Ethical Risks
   6.1 Antisemitic trope avoidance and symmetry of scrutiny
   6.2 Restoring Palestinian and Israeli subjectivity
7. From Symbol to Specifics: Legal–Empirical Anchors
   7.1 IHL baselines (civilians, proportionality, detention)
   7.2 Settlements, blockades, hostages, rockets: measurable claims
8. Implications
   8.1 Policy design: reducing projection incentives
   8.2 Movement strategy: escaping purity spirals
   8.3 Research agenda: metrics for projection and salience
9. Conclusion: Seeing the Shadow, Holding the Law

References

1. Introduction: From Geopolitics to Archetype

International attention to Israel/Palestine has long been analyzed through the familiar lenses of geopolitics, international law, colonial and postcolonial studies, media effects, and religion. These frames are indispensable; they inventory actors, institutions, incentives, and doctrines with admirable precision. Yet they struggle to explain *why* this conflict so reliably acquires a symbolic excess—why it captures far more psychic bandwidth than many structurally comparable crises; why stakeholders oscillate between idealization and demonization with unusual volatility; why mirror-accusations proliferate; and why otherwise consistent actors suspend or invert their stated principles when the topic arises. This article proposes that such anomalies are not peripheral noise but central data. They signal the presence of *archetypal* charge and the operations of collective projection.

The Jungian concept of the **Shadow**—the disowned elements of the psyche that are denied, split off, and then perceived "out there"—offers a disciplined way to interpret this surplus intensity. Applying the concept at the collective level does not replace historical or legal analysis; rather, it clarifies recurrent patterns of attention and affect that those analyses typically bracket. The claim is not that Israel "is" evil or holy, nor that archetypes operate as occult forces, but that the conflict functions globally as a **projection surface** for unresolved material around trauma and force, chosenness and law, borders and belonging. When policy debates become mythic dramas and empirical disputes become identity referenda, we are in the terrain of archetypal inflation. Recognizing that terrain helps explain puzzling behaviors and may modestly improve the design of interventions that aim for de-escalation, accountability, and symmetry of scrutiny.

Accordingly, this introduction situates the article's argument in two steps. Section **1.1** clarifies the motivation and scope: why an archetypal lens adds explanatory power, what questions it can credibly address, and how it will be paired with legal–empirical anchors to avoid speculative drift. Section **1.2** marks the limits: why the Shadow is a *metaphor* for collective behavior rather than a metaphysical claim about nations-as-persons, and what ethical hazards attend any analysis that touches the long history of antisemitic and Islamophobic projection. The remainder of the paper then develops the theoretical frame, articulates why Israel uniquely concentrates projection dynamics, catalogs patterned evidence, and proposes guardrails and implications.

1.1 Motivation and scope

Three empirical puzzles motivate this inquiry.

First, attention asymmetry. Across news cycles, campuses, parliamentary debates, and street mobilizations, Israel/Palestine receives a quantum of attention that often exceeds comparators on measures of civilian harm, displacement, or duration. Traditional explanations—media bias, diaspora lobbying, strategic interests—have merit but do not exhaust the phenomenon. An archetypal account predicts precisely this: projection clusters where symbols are numinous, where identity commitments are pre-loaded, and where contradictions can be outsourced to a compact screen.

Second, oscillatory moral valuations. Israel and its antagonists are alternately sacralized and demonized with striking speed: "light unto nations" yields to "uniquely malevolent actor," and back again. Similarly, activist and policy communities exhibit purity spirals—tests of moral belonging that fracture coalitions and penalize nuance. In a Shadow reading, such oscillations reflect splitting and projective identification: intolerable traits are evacuated and then fought in the other; ambivalence is managed by flipping whole-object valuations rather than integrating conflictual truths.

Third, mimetic accusation and standard-shifting. Parties accuse one another in mirrored terms (coloniality, terror, dehumanization), and external observers shift standards of evidence or legal emphasis depending on the actor. A projection model anticipates mirroring and inconsistency: we are harshest where we are least integrated, and we see, name, and punish in the other what we cannot reconcile in ourselves.

Scope. The article's scope is analytic, not adjudicative. It does **not** seek to determine ultimate culpability or to weigh specific operations in international humanitarian law (IHL) terms—tasks suited to courts, fact-finding missions, and domain experts. Instead, it explains recurrent **patterns of perception and reaction** that shape the environment in which legal and policy decisions are made. The argument is therefore complementary to, not substitutive of, legal–historical work.

Method. The method is interpretive and comparative. Part II reviews Jungian concepts (Shadow, projection, inflation) as adapted for collective phenomena; Part III argues that Israel is overdetermined for projection by a conjunction of (a) sacred geography with modern sovereignty, (b) trauma-to-power inversion, (c) liminal civilizational positioning, and (d) dense diasporic entanglement. Part IV catalogs behavioral indicators (attention metrics, rhetorical mirroring, policy inconsistency). Part V compares cases lacking the full "stack" to specify what is unique versus generalizable. Throughout, the archetypal lens is tethered to **empirical anchors**—media salience data, documented rhetoric, and explicit legal standards—to discipline inference.

Audience and payoffs. For scholars, the payoff is a portable framework for recognizing projection dynamics in other conflicts where numinosity intersects with state power. For practitioners, it suggests modest interventions—message framing, standard symmetry, de-inflation techniques—that may reduce archetypal heat without evacuating accountability.

1.2 Metaphor, not metaphysics: limits of collective psychology

Invoking the Jungian Shadow at the level of publics and polities invites category mistakes. A state does not have a subconscious; archetypes are not agents. To avoid reifying metaphor into metaphysics, this section sets four limits.

Limit 1: The subject of analysis is behavior, not essence. The claim concerns *how observers and institutions respond*—patterns of attention, valuation, and rhetoric—not the "soul" of any group. Israel, Palestinians, and their diasporas are treated as **subjects** with plural, contested identities, not as vessels of archetypal qualities. The Shadow is a model for **externalization dynamics**, not an attribute of a people.

Limit 2: Complementarity with material and legal accounts. Projection does not negate causality. Land regimes, military doctrines, electoral incentives, energy and trade structures, and court decisions remain primary determinants of outcomes. The archetypal lens addresses *why* those determinants are perceived and weighted as they are in specific publics, *not* whether they exist or what they prescribe. When prescription is at stake, the article defers to **IHL baselines** (proportionality, distinction, humane treatment) and to evidence.

Limit 3: Ethical hazard and trope-awareness. Shadow discourse risks echoing antisemitic or Islamophobic tropes (e.g., ascribing cosmic malignity, conspiracism, or sacral exceptionalism). To mitigate this, the analysis (a) consistently frames the Shadow as the **world's** disowned material, not as Jewish or Muslim essence; (b) applies **symmetry of scrutiny** to all parties; and (c) moves from symbol to **specificity** when discussing harms: civilian protection, settlements, rockets, hostages, detainees, incitement, blockade effects.

Limit 4: Falsifiability by pattern, not event. Archetypal explanations do not predict discrete events; they predict **regularities in perception**—e.g., disproportionate salience given certain symbolic triggers; mirrored rhetoric after specific provocations; standard-shifts clustered around sacred times or sites. The account is therefore vulnerable to disconfirmation if such regularities fail to obtain across episodes or if comparators with similar structural features routinely elicit equivalent attention without the posited numinous conditions.

Taken together, these limits mark the analysis as a **heuristic** for intelligibility rather than an ontology. The Shadow is a disciplined metaphor for recurring, measurable features of collective

response in a conflict uniquely primed for projection. If the metaphor helps us see—and then temper—archetypal inflation while keeping debates anchored to law and lives, it has earned its keep; where it tempts essentialism or excuses, it must be curtailed.

2. Conceptual Framework: Shadow, Projection, and Collective Phenomena

This section supplies the psychological grammar used later in the paper. It distinguishes **Shadow**, **projection**, and **projective identification**; explains how these processes scale in crowds, institutions, and media systems; and sets observable indicators that will discipline the metaphor in subsequent sections.

2.1 The Shadow and projective identification

The Shadow (Jung).
In classical Jungian usage, the *Shadow* is the set of personally disavowed traits, affects, and histories—anger, cruelty, envy, dependency, complicity—that the ego cannot tolerate. Because the ego is motivated to preserve a coherent self-concept, Shadow contents are split off and then **encountered outside** the self as if they belonged to someone else. Two clarifications keep the concept tidy:

- **Not just "badness."** The Shadow contains *positive* potentials the ego has disowned (tenderness, creativity, vulnerability) when they threaten the persona.
- **Situated and dynamic.** Contents of the Shadow vary with biography and context; they shift with threat, shame, and group belonging.

Projection (Jung, general).
Projection is the mechanism by which Shadow contents are attributed to others and then reacted to as if they were truly external. Its signatures include: overcertainty ("I just *know* what they are"), affect disproportionate to the object, selective attention to confirming cues, and resistance to disconfirming evidence. Projection economizes on psychological labor: by disowning what is mine, I avoid integration.

Projective identification (Klein; Bion).
Later analytic theory adds a more "interactive" account. In *projective identification*, disowned affect is not only attributed to the other; the projector **presses** the other—by cueing, provocation, or role assignment—to **carry** and enact the projected material. Interactions become scripts. In politics this looks like: framing the opponent as monstrous until they respond

defensively in ways that **confirm** monstrosity to the projector's audience. The projector then "recognizes" the trait they seeded.

Inflation and splitting.
When projections accumulate, the ego inflates—oscillating between halo and horn. *Splitting* divides the world into all-good and all-bad objects. In collective settings, inflation and splitting produce **idealization/demonization cycles**, purity tests, and shunning rituals.

From psyche to symbol.
Archetypes structure the forms projection can take—parent/child, savior/dragon, pure/impure, chosen/forsaken. They are not contents but **patterns** that confer *numinosity*, making some events feel inexhaustibly significant. Where archetypal patterns meet political objects, attention and affect predictably surge.

Operational markers (used later):

- *Shadow cues:* moral overreach ("uniquely evil/holy"), inability to integrate ambivalence, insistence on certainty.
- *Projection cues:* asymmetric empathy, evidence selectivity, compulsive repetition of the same charge across cases.
- *Projective identification cues:* behavior-changing feedback loops in which accusations help produce the very conduct they condemn.
- *Inflation cues:* rapid flips between sanctification and vilification; growth of cosmic language and apocalyptic framing.

2.2 From individuals to polities: methodological cautions

Applying clinical concepts to publics and states invites error. This subsection states **how** to scale the concepts—and **where** to stop.

A. Units and carriers: no national "psyche."
There is no literal group subconscious. Collective phenomena arise when **many individual psyches** align through institutions, media, rituals, and incentives. We therefore speak of **projection *dynamics***, not national Shadows. The carriers include:

1. **Media systems.** Editorial norms, recommendation engines, and click economies amplify arousing content and suppress integrative nuance—mechanizing projection and splitting.

2. **Institutions and elites.** Parties, courts, NGOs, clerics, and universities set salience and supply frames that invite or restrain projection.
3. **Ritual calendars and sacred space.** Holidays, holy sites, martyr commemorations, and anniversaries heighten archetypal readiness; small triggers there have outsized effects.
4. **Diasporic networks.** Transnational identification creates fast "affect circuits," letting projections propagate across borders and re-enter local politics.

B. What "scaling" means (mechanisms, not metaphors).
To avoid anthropomorphism, collective Shadow talk must resolve into **mechanisms** that are empirically trackable:

- **Selection:** environments that preferentially select Shadow-congruent narratives (algorithmic amplification, editorial priors).
- **Synchronization:** rapid alignment of frames across nodes (hashtag cascades, sermon themes, party talking points).
- **Reinforcement:** social rewards for Shadow-congruent speech (likes, promotions, invitations) and sanctions for integration attempts (pillorying for "both-sidesism").
- **Enactment:** policy or protest behaviors that embody projected roles (tit-for-tat escalations, sacrilege panics).

C. Guardrails for inference.

1. **Complementarity with material causes.** Projection dynamics modulate *perception* and *valuation*; they do not replace military, legal, or economic causation. Always ask: what does the archetypal account explain that interest-based models do not?
2. **Pattern-level falsifiability.** Do not predict specific events. Predict **regularities**: e.g., (i) attention spikes around sacred triggers exceed baselines of comparable harm; (ii) mirrored accusations rise after humiliation events; (iii) legal standards shift with identity of actor. Failure of these regularities across episodes is disconfirming.
3. **Symmetry and specificity.** Apply the same projection tests to all parties, including one's own polity; tether claims to **named** texts, speeches, votes, and coverage.
4. **Avoid moral outsourcing.** The framework is diagnostic, not exculpatory. It should sharpen accountability by exposing *why* standards drift, not excuse drift.

D. Measurement suggestions (to discipline the lens).
Later sections propose a mixed-methods design; here are the relevant indicators:

- **Salience and volatility:** time-series of news volume, social engagement, and legislative attention compared to structural comparators; volatility (spike–decay) as a proxy for archetypal heat.
- **Trigger alignment:** event studies around symbolic moments (holy days, site-related incidents, hostage rituals) to test for outsize attention shifts.
- **Mirror rhetoric:** computational detection of accusation pairs (e.g., "genocide," "colonial," "terrorist," "dehumanize") across opposing camps within tight windows.
- **Standard-shifting:** coding of legal frames (proportionality vs. sovereignty vs. self-defense) by actor and episode to detect systematic asymmetry.
- **Inflation language:** dictionary of cosmic/numinous terms (Armageddon, Holocaust analogies, Caliphate, Third Temple, chosenness) and their co-occurrence with policy debate.
- **Role induction (projective identification):** sequence analysis testing whether prior accusations predict opponent behavior (e.g., securitization moves) beyond base rates.

E. Ethical cautions.
Because this topic intersects with antisemitism and Islamophobia, three constraints operate throughout:

- **Non-essentialism:** Never treat archetypal attributions as properties of peoples; treat them as **attributions by observers**.
- **Subject restoration:** Use the framework to *restore* Israeli and Palestinian subjectivity—by showing how projections occlude concrete human stakes—rather than to re-mythologize them.
- **Law as ballast:** Anchor every normative implication to IHL and human-rights baselines; when archetypal heat rises, return to *specific harms* and *enforceable standards*.

Summary.
Shadow, projection, and projective identification describe how disowned material gets exported, recognized, and fought in others. At scale, institutions and media create efficient markets for these exports, especially where symbols are sacred and identities are pre-loaded. The framework earns its keep only if it predicts **patterns of attention, rhetoric, and inconsistency** that survive contact with data and if it helps practitioners design interventions that cool archetypal inflation without relaxing accountability.

3. Why Israel? The Fourfold Overdetermination

This section explains why Israel, more than other states, concentrates global Shadow dynamics. The claim is not metaphysical uniqueness but **overdetermination**: multiple, mutually reinforcing conditions stack to produce unusually high archetypal voltage. Each subsection identifies mechanisms, observable indicators, and counterfactuals.

3.1 Sacred geography + modern sovereignty (numinosity and myth)

Mechanism.
Few polities fuse a landscape saturated with **sacred narrative**—Jerusalem, Hebron, Bethlehem, al-Aqsa/Temple Mount, the Galilee—with an ordinary modern state that fields courts, parties, budgets, tech clusters, and an army. This pairing couples the charge of **numinosity** (archetypal meaning perceived as inexhaustible) to the routines of **sovereign administration**. When bureaucratic or military acts occur on sacralized ground, their meanings are **mythically amplified**: zoning becomes "desecration," policing becomes "sacrilege," excavation becomes eschatology.

Projection consequences.
Sacred space renders outsiders psychologically proximal: pilgrims, scriptures, liturgies, and popular culture pre-load identities worldwide. That pre-loading primes **splitting** (pure/impure, chosen/forsaken) and **inflation** (cosmic stakes). In such environments, projection has low friction: people "recognize" their own disowned conflicts (faith/modernity, purity/power) in events they barely understand in detail.

Indicators.

- **Trigger effects**: outsized attention spikes around incidents involving holy sites or sacred calendars relative to structurally similar harms elsewhere.
- **Lexical inflation**: rapid migration of debate into sacrilegious/eschatological registers (Armageddon, Third Temple, Caliphate, "end times").
- **Boundary collapse**: global religious leaders and lay publics treating administrative acts as direct intrusions on their own identities.

Counterfactuals.
Conflicts with grave harm but without numinous geography (e.g., remote civil wars) rarely elicit equivalent symbolic escalation or global identity activation.

3.2 Trauma-to-power inversion (victimhood and hard power)

Mechanism.
The modern Jewish experience combines **catastrophic victimization** (pogroms, the Shoah) with the subsequent acquisition of **statehood and hard power**. This compresses into one emblem the paradox many societies cannot integrate: *How should historical trauma inform present coercion?* The inversion destabilizes common moral heuristics (victim = powerless; power = perpetrator) and invites **projective displacement** of unresolved guilt, envy, or resentment.

Projection consequences.
Observers oscillate between **idealization** (redemptive survival, "light unto nations") and **demonization** (betrayal of victim ethics). Both positions can externalize the observer's own ambivalence about force and memory: punitive uses of trauma at home can be condemned "over there"; denial or minimization of trauma can be rationalized via selective comparison "over there."

Indicators.

- **Holocaust analogy inflation** across all sides—weaponized memory as moral currency.
- **Double standards**: actors who justify harsh security measures domestically become hyper-legalist abroad (or vice versa), mapped to their unresolved victim–power narratives.
- **Guilt management**: rhetoric that outsources European colonial violence or Middle Eastern authoritarian repression into judgments about Israel's legitimacy tout court.

Counterfactuals.
States with power but no widely shared trauma narrative (or vice versa) attract attention on strategic grounds but lack the same **moral vertigo** that supercharges projection.

3.3 Liminality (East/West, secular/religious, diaspora/homeland)

Mechanism.
Israel is **liminal** across multiple axes:

- **Geopolitical:** perched between "West" and "non-West," participating in OECD and NATO-adjacent forums while embedded in the Levant.
- **Civilizational:** bearer of a Jewish civilizational project amid Arab and Islamic civilizations, alongside substantial Arab/Palestinian populations.

- **Regime-type:** self-defined as both **Jewish** and **democratic**, toggling between liberal and theocratic pulls.
- **Sociocultural:** high-tech cosmopolitanism coexisting with ethnic, religious, and class stratification.

Liminal entities are psychologically useful: they can be cast as **us** or **not-us** as needed, becoming **mirrors** or **screens** on demand.

Projection consequences.
Because liminal identities are ambiguous, they attract **contradictory projections**. Western liberals may demand exemplary liberal conduct ("like us") while condemning particularism ("unlike us"). Regional actors may treat Israel as both foreign imposition and familiar Middle Eastern polity. Religious observers may celebrate covenantal continuity while secularists insist on procedural universals—each projecting disowned doubts about their own commitments.

Indicators.

- **Frame switching** by the same commentator or institution across episodes (civilizational ally → settler outpost; minority refuge → majoritarian project).
- **Identity-contingent standards**: legal or moral principles applied or suspended depending on whether Israel is rhetorically positioned as "inside" or "outside" a reference community.
- **Audience segmentation**: political entrepreneurs code-switching frames for different publics with little reputational penalty, indicating acceptability of ambiguity.

Counterfactuals.
Clear "inside" or "outside" states (hegemonic cores or obvious adversaries) elicit stable frames; liminality sustains **volatile** projections.

3.4 Diasporic entanglement and transnational affect circuits

Mechanism.
The Jewish diaspora is demographically diffuse and institutionally dense; Christian and Muslim attachments to the land are numerically vast. Events in Israel/Palestine therefore traverse **transnational affect circuits**—synagogues, churches, mosques, campus groups, professional associations, NGOs, and social media—faster than conventional diplomacy. Diasporas create **feedback loops**: local politics shape readings of distant events, which feed back into local identity policing, elections, philanthropy, and security policy.

Projection consequences.
Diasporic entanglement multiplies **ego–Shadow linkages**: personal and communal identities feel directly implicated in faraway acts. This proximity makes **projective identification** easier: communities cast each other into roles (colonizer/terrorist; apostate/true believer), and some actors begin to **perform** those scripts to maintain belonging. Domestic coalitions realign along imported cleavages (e.g., left–right or secular–religious fractures refracted through the conflict).

Indicators.

- **Rapid transnational synchronization**: sermon themes, protest slogans, donor campaigns, and campus statements converging within days of an event.
- **Role induction**: public shaming or credentialing that demands individuals "carry" projected traits (e.g., Jews as unconditional state proxies; Muslims/Arabs as inherent militants), with penalties for refusal.
- **Policy bleed-through**: municipal or corporate governance adopting positions more symbolic than operational, indicating identity maintenance rather than instrumental policy.

Counterfactuals.
Conflicts without large, organized diasporas or pan-religious attachments rarely generate the same **everywhere-all-at-once** identity activation or the same salience within workplaces, campuses, and city councils.

Synthesis.
Sacred geography injects **numinosity**; trauma-to-power compresses **moral paradox**; liminality enables **frame plasticity**; diasporas build **amplifiers**. Each factor can attract projections on its own; together they create a **high-gain circuit** in which global audiences repeatedly export disowned material onto Israel/Palestine and then react to their own projections as if they were foreign objects. The remainder of the paper operationalizes these claims with pattern-level evidence and contrasts with cases lacking one or more elements, specifying what is generalizable and what is overdetermined in this conflict.

4. Behavioral Evidence of Shadow Dynamics

This section operationalizes the framework by specifying **pattern-level indicators** and showing how they appear across media, academia, and diplomacy. The aim is not to adjudicate discrete claims but to identify **regularities**—attention asymmetry, valuation oscillations, mirrored rhetoric, and standard-shifting—that a Shadow account predicts.

4.1 Attention asymmetry across media, academy, and diplomacy

Claim. Israel/Palestine attracts *disproportionate salience* compared with structurally similar conflicts, especially around **symbolic triggers** (holy sites, sacred times, hostages, covenantal language).

How to measure.

- **Media time-series.** Compare weekly news volume and front-page share to benchmarks (civilian casualty counts, displacement, conflict duration). Model **spike–decay** dynamics; Shadow predicts **steeper spikes** and **slower decay** around sacred triggers than around purely strategic events.
- **Academic signal.** Track publication counts, special issues, campus resolutions, conference panels by field-normalized ratios. Expect **topic concentration** out of proportion to disciplinary baselines for international crises.
- **Diplomatic airtime.** Code UN agenda items, emergency sessions, leader statements, and sanction debates per unit harm. Expect **agenda crowd-out** effects following symbolic incidents.

Qualitative markers.

- Headlines escalate to **cosmic** or **civilizational** registers even for administrative actions (zoning, archaeology, police protocols) when they intersect sacred geography.
- NGOs and professional associations release **identity-position statements** on Israel/Palestine at rates not observed for comparably lethal conflicts, indicating identity activation rather than domain adjacency.

Shadow reading. Numinous symbols act as **attention magnets**; projection concentrates where observers can outsource disowned contradictions (purity/power, faith/modernity) to a compact screen.

4.2 Oscillating idealization/demonization and purity traps

Claim. Evaluations swing rapidly between **halo** ("light unto nations," "only democracy…") and **horn** ("uniquely malevolent," "beyond the pale"), with coalition dynamics policed by **purity tests**.

How to measure.

- **Sentiment volatility.** Track polarity in headlines, elite tweets, and parliamentary speeches. Compute **flip frequency** (time between positive and negative peaks) and **amplitude** (distance between peaks). Shadow predicts higher volatility than in comparator conflicts.
- **Purity enforcement.** Code organizational sanction events (disinvitations, firings, board resignations) and activist shibboleths (required phrases/omissions). Expect **low tolerance for ambivalence** and penalties for integrative positions.

Qualitative markers.

- "If–then" belonging rules: *If you acknowledge X harm, you must deny Y harm*, with little space for **both/and** claims.
- Coalitions fracture over **symbolic wording** (e.g., order of victim naming) rather than over concrete policy differences, suggesting identity purification.

Shadow reading. Splitting and **inflation** dominate: intolerable ambivalence is managed by flipping whole-object valuations; groups maintain coherence by **exiling complexity**.

4.3 Mimetic accusations and mirror rhetoric

Claim. Opposing actors deploy **the same accusation set**—genocide, colonialism, terrorism, dehumanization—often in temporal lockstep, each claiming exclusive ownership of victimhood and law.

How to measure.

- **Rhetorical mirroring index.** Use NLP to detect accusation pairs across adversarial corpora (official statements, movement posts). Measure **lag time** between accusation and counter-accusation and the **lexical overlap** of justificatory frames.
- **Analogy inflation.** Track frequency and context of high-charge analogies (Holocaust, apartheid, crusades). Shadow predicts **escalation** of analogies after humiliation events and around sacred times/sites.

Qualitative markers.

- Clause-for-clause *reflection* in justificatory briefs: each side cites the same legal principles (self-defense, proportionality), infers *opposite* conclusions, and imputes **bad faith** to the other's use of law.
- Grassroots slogans mirror each other's **dehumanization alarms**, each insisting the other uniquely denies personhood.

Shadow reading. Projection and **projective identification** co-produce scripts: by casting the other as monstrous, actors invite defensive behaviors that **confirm** monstrosity in the eyes of their publics.

4.4 Policy inconsistency as displacement

Claim. External observers (states, institutions, civic bodies) display **standard-shifting**—tightening or loosening legal and moral criteria depending on the actor—consistent with **displaced** self-judgment.

How to measure.

- **Standards coding.** Annotate official statements for invoked doctrines (distinction, proportionality, sovereignty, occupation, collective punishment). Compare **doctrine mix** applied to Israel/Palestine vs. other theaters by the same speaker within the same time window.
- **Threshold asymmetry.** Record **evidentiary thresholds** (what counts as proof, acceptable casualty estimates, deference to military necessity) and **remedy thresholds** (sanctions, embargo calls) across cases.
- **Institutional consistency.** Examine vote patterns and disciplinary actions within universities, churches, medical associations, city councils: when do institutions that rarely opine on foreign policy adopt **sweeping positions** here, and with what internal due process?

Qualitative markers.

- "Moving goalposts" in conditionality for aid, arms transfers, or recognition; **retroactive reinterpretations** of doctrines to fit preferred outcomes.
- Moral claims framed as **identity boundary work** ("as a [profession/faith], we must…") rather than as enforceable policy logic.

Shadow reading. Inconsistency functions as **moral outsourcing**: by exacting maximal purity from a symbolically loaded conflict, actors avoid integrating their own **complicity** in comparable practices at home or with allies/adversaries elsewhere.

Interim synthesis. Across these four behaviors—salience spikes, valuation whiplash, mirrored accusation, and standard-shifting—the data structure matches Shadow predictions: **numinous triggers**, **split valuations**, **reflexive mirroring**, and **displaced standards**. The framework earns explanatory traction to the extent these patterns persist across episodes and diverge from comparator conflicts after controlling for harm and strategic interest. Subsequent sections propose **case-comparison tests** and **guardrails** to keep the analysis tethered to law and specific harms while diagnosing projection dynamics that otherwise obscure accountability.

5. Case Comparisons and Counterexamples

Comparisons clarify what in the Israel/Palestine case is general to conflict politics and what is **overdetermined** by the "full stack" (sacred geography + trauma-to-power inversion + liminality + dense diasporas). Here I sketch contrasts that share some elements but lack the complete configuration.

5.1 United States, China, Russia: power without numinosity

Why they are instructive.
These are the principal global foils. Each is a durable screen for projection—yet the *quality* of attention differs. The Shadow lens predicts high salience where symbols are **numinous** and identities are pre-loaded by **sacred narrative**. Great powers command attention through hegemony, not holiness.

United States.

- **What it has:** unrivaled reach; a civil religion; global media production; long colonial/imperial debates.
- **What it lacks:** widely shared *sacred geography* legible across world faiths; a compact, publicly owned trauma-to-power narrative comparable to the Shoah-to-sovereignty arc.
- **Prediction/observation:** Salience is chronic rather than **spiky**; evaluative swings are often partisan/ideological rather than archetypal; comparisons tend to read as **interest**

politics more than mythic inflation. Shadow dynamics exist (exceptionalism/anti-exceptionalism), but the numinous voltage is lower.

China.

- **What it has:** rising power; civilizational narrative; surveillance state imagery; Xinjiang/Tibet attention.
- **What it lacks:** trans-religious sacred claim that implicates billions *personally*; an emotionally shared trauma-to-power emblem recognized by outsiders; liminality (it is framed as clearly "other" in many Western publics).
- **Prediction/observation:** Morality frames cluster around **human-rights/instrumental** logics; diasporic affect circuits are present but narrower; the conflict seldom colonizes non-adjacent institutions (e.g., university departments, city councils) to the degree Israel/Palestine does.

Russia.

- **What it has:** stark aggression cases; Cold War residue; Orthodox sacrality for some publics.
- **What it lacks:** a universalized sacred landscape; a positive, globally shared trauma-to-power narrative; ambiguity of liminality (Russia is usually coded "outside").
- **Prediction/observation:** Spikes in attention are tied to **kinetic thresholds** (invasions, atrocities) more than to holy-time/site triggers; rhetoric is apocalyptic at times, but coalition boundary work is less identity-defining for distant publics.

Takeaway.
Great powers are **projection targets** but typically without **numinous amplification**. Their conflicts elicit outrage, solidarity, and realignments, yet they less often produce the **everywhere-all-at-once** identity policing and ritualized purity tests that mark archetypal inflation.

5.2 India–Pakistan, Iran, Saudi Arabia: regional mirrors lacking the full stack

Why they are instructive.
These cases share multiple ingredients—religion–state entanglement, sacred sites, partition trauma, diasporas—yet they still fall short of the global archetypal charge attributed to Israel/Palestine. Contrasting them helps isolate which **stack elements** are decisive.

India–Pakistan.

- **Shared elements:** Partition trauma; nuclear dyad; Kashmir as a sacralized locus; large, vocal diasporas in the UK, North America, and the Gulf; liminal self-presentations (civilizational and liberal-democratic claims in tension).
- **Missing/attenuated element:** A *single* site legible as sacred to billions across *multiple* world religions in the same way Jerusalem/al-Aqsa/Temple Mount functions; fewer Christian liturgical hooks; less Western self-implication via Holocaust memory.
- **Prediction/observation:** Strong **regional** archetypal heat (especially in South Asian diasporas) with periodic international spikes, but lower **cross-faith** activation; campus and municipal politics outside South Asian networks are less colonized by purity scripts.

Iran.

- **Shared elements:** Theocratic claims; martyrdom theology; sacred calendar; diasporic activism; liminality in global alignments.
- **Missing/attenuated element:** Diaspora distribution is significant but not as **multiconfessional**; sacred geography is compelling mainly within Shi'a and Islamic frames; the regime's narrative foregrounds ideology over universally shared trauma-to-power inversion recognizable to outsiders as their own.
- **Prediction/observation:** Numinous language appears in specific publics, but **global** attention more often routes through security and rights frames (nuclear program, women's rights); fewer third-party institutions adopt **identity-position statements** untethered to their remit.

Saudi Arabia.

- **Shared elements:** Custodian of Mecca and Medina (high numinosity for Muslims); oil-hegemonic entanglements; human-rights controversies.
- **Missing/attenuated element:** The holy sites' sacrality does not translate into **multi-faith** personal identification; trauma-to-power inversion is not the dominant global story; diasporic entanglement is narrower and politically constrained.
- **Prediction/observation:** High salience in Muslim publics; globally, attention remains **instrumental** (energy, arms, rights), with fewer **mirror-accusation spirals** among non-adjacent communities.

Synthesis across the trio.
Each case exhibits **parts of the stack**—sacred space, trauma, liminality, diaspora—but not all at once, or not in a way that binds **multiple world faiths** and **diverse diasporas** to a **geographically small** theater. As a result, projection dynamics are powerful **within** certain identity spheres but less capable of triggering the **planetary-scale** purity rituals and standard-shifting observed with Israel/Palestine.

Comparative upshot.

- **Generalizable:** Projection, splitting, and projective identification appear wherever identities are threatened and information systems reward arousal.
- **Distinctive to Israel/Palestine:** The *conjunction* of **sacred geography that is cross-religiously legible**, a **trauma-to-power inversion** widely recognized in the global moral imagination, **persistent liminality** enabling frame-switches, and **densely networked diasporas** spanning multiple confessions. This conjunction yields greater **archetypal voltage**, producing attention asymmetries, valuation whiplash, mirrored rhetoric, and displaced standards at scales and in venues less common elsewhere.

These contrasts do not excuse or condemn any actor; they locate **why** this conflict so often becomes a **projection screen** for the world's disowned materials—and therefore why consistent, law-bound scrutiny is both harder and more necessary here.

6. Guardrails and Ethical Risks

The Shadow lens is powerful precisely because it trades in symbol and affect. That is also its danger. This section installs **brakes**: practices that minimize harm, avoid trope-reproduction, and keep analysis tethered to law and lives rather than to myth.

6.1 Antisemitic trope avoidance and symmetry of scrutiny

Core principle. Treat *projection* as a property of observers and systems, **not** an essence of Jews, Israelis, Muslims, or Palestinians. The Shadow here is **the world's** disowned material.

A. Tropes to actively avoid (with practical replacements)

- **Cosmic malignancy / metaphysical guilt** ("a uniquely evil people").
  → *Replace with*: pattern claims about **attention, rhetoric, and standards**, tied to evidence and time-bounded episodes.

- **Conspiracy/omnipotence** (global control, dual loyalty, clandestine cabals).
  → *Replace with*: **institutional analysis** (diaspora advocacy, media incentives) with named organizations, budgets, methods, and **comparators**.

- **Blood/essence metaphors** (innate traits, "chosen" as superiority).
  → *Replace with*: **textual** and **legal** references; if discussing chosenness, cite theological variations and their political translations, avoiding reification.

- **Holocaust-baiting** (instrumentalizing the Shoah to delegitimize Jewish subjectivity, or flattening it into a rhetorical cudgel).
  → *Replace with*: careful **memory politics** analysis: who invokes which analogy, when, and with what consequences—and explicit limits on analogy.

B. Symmetry of scrutiny (IHL as the yardstick)

- **Single metric, many subjects.** Apply the same international humanitarian law (IHL) baselines—**distinction**, **proportionality**, **precautions**, **humane treatment**—to:

  1. the Israeli state and its security agencies;
  2. Palestinian armed groups and governing entities;
  3. regional states (Egypt, Lebanon, Iran, Gulf actors);
  4. external patrons (U.S., EU states, Russia, others);
  5. one's **own** government.

- **Evidentiary discipline.** For all parties: declare **sources**, **confidence levels**, and **known uncertainties**; disallow double standards for proof or remedy thresholds.

- **Comparator control.** When claiming exceptionalism, present **paired cases** (e.g., sieges, occupation regimes, urban warfare) and show where Israel/Palestine patterns diverge *after* controlling for context.

- **Sanction parity.** If recommending sanctions/aid conditionality, articulate **criteria** that would trigger the same response in comparators; if not, name the ethically relevant difference.

C. Language hygiene checklist

- Avoid **collectivizing nouns** ("the Jews," "the Arabs," "the Palestinians," "the Israelis"). Prefer **role-bound** terms (government, armed group, ministry, party, brigade, NGO, municipality).

- Flag and minimize **apocalyptic diction** unless analyzing it as a phenomenon.

- Separate **diagnosis** (projection dynamics) from **judgment** (legal/normative findings). Don't launder moral claims as psychology.

D. Research/process guardrails

- **Triangulate** Hebrew-, Arabic-, and English-language sources; use professional translations when quoting.
- Maintain a **citation symmetry** (e.g., legal reports, watchdogs, and rights groups across the spectrum).
- Pre-register **coding schemes** for sentiment, analogy, and standards to curb post hoc rationalization.

6.2 Restoring Palestinian and Israeli subjectivity

Core principle. The Shadow frame risks turning living communities into symbols. Counteract that by **restoring agency, plurality, and specificity**.

A. From symbols to subjects

- **Name agents and actions.** Replace "Israel did X" / "Palestine did Y" with **actor-specific** attributions (IDF unit, ministry, party; Hamas brigade, PIJ cell, PA security force, municipal authority).
- **Pluralize identities.** Show internal **diversity**: Mizrahi/Ashkenazi/Ethiopian/Bedouin/Arab citizens; secular/religious/Haredi; left/right; Jewish/Palestinian feminist, labor, legal, and peace networks. Likewise, Palestinian Christians/Muslims, clan/party affiliations, West Bank/Gaza/Jerusalem/'48 Palestinians, refugees and camps, labor and student movements.
- **Agency beyond victimhood/perpetratorhood.** Document organizing, jurisprudence, aid delivery, cultural production, and intra-communal debate—not only suffering or violence.

B. Epistemic practices that humanize

- **Quote ordinary voices** with consent and context; avoid trauma voyeurism. Pair elite documents with **local reporting**.
- **Temporal precision.** Anchor claims to **dates and sequences**; respect how timing (holy days, mourning periods, elections) shapes meaning on the ground.

- **Proportional imagery.** Do not over-index on spectacular visuals; balance with **quiet harms** (displacement processes, detention, livelihoods) and **quiet solidarities** (cross-lines medical care, legal clinics).

C. Method steps that resist re-mythologizing

- **Dual-source interviews** (paired Israeli/Palestinian practitioners on the same policy domain: e.g., emergency medicine, water, education, courts).
- **Mirror coding.** When you code "dehumanizing rhetoric" for one side, code the **same categories** for the other; publish both.
- **Context windows.** Read incendiary clips against **longer transcripts**; note edits and platform incentives; include right of reply.

D. Ethical safeguards

- **Do-no-harm review.** For named individuals at risk (activists, soldiers, civil servants), assess exposure and consider anonymization.
- **Consent clarity.** Obtain documented consent for field materials; avoid extracting testimony in moments of acute trauma for performative ends.
- **Reciprocity.** Share findings with local partners; correct translations and factual errors flagged by subjects where safe.

E. Pedagogy and public writing

- **Both/and assignments.** In courses or public forums, require students/readers to formulate **paired legal assessments** (e.g., an operation and a rocket campaign) using the same rubric.
- **Vocabulary drills.** Teach the difference between **archetypal language** (symbol, numinous, Shadow) and **legal language** (occupation, siege, proportionality) and insist on clear signposting when switching registers.
- **De-inflation moves.** When discussion overheats, shift to **checklist prompts**: "What is the precise claim? What evidence? What standard? What comparator? What remedy?"

Bottom line. The value of a Shadow analysis depends on whether it **reduces mythic fog** while **increasing accountability**. Avoiding antisemitic tropes and practicing symmetry of scrutiny protects against projection's ethical pitfalls. Restoring Palestinian and Israeli subjectivity ensures that archetype serves history and law—not the other way around.

7. From Symbol to Specifics: Legal–Empirical Anchors

The archetypal lens earns credibility only when it is paired with **verifiable, law-bound facts**. This section operationalizes a symmetric evidentiary program: what to measure, how to measure it, and which legal baselines to use—so that diagnosis of projection **constrains** rather than replaces accountability.

7.1 IHL baselines (civilians, proportionality, detention)

Purpose. Fix a single yardstick—International Humanitarian Law (IHL)—and apply it **to all parties**. Distinguish *legal* questions (rule compliance) from *political* judgments (prudence, legitimacy). Use dates, actors, and sources explicit enough to survive adversarial review.

Core rules to anchor analysis

1. **Distinction (combatant vs. civilian).**
    - *Questions:* Who/what was targeted? Were targets of a kind that are *by nature, location, purpose or use* military objectives?
    - *Data:* Strike coordinates; target categories; visual evidence; targeteers' stated aim; independent imagery; claim–counterclaim tables.
    - *Symmetry:* Code state strikes and non-state attacks with the **same schema** (e.g., mortar/rocket vs. guided munitions; site type; time of day).
2. **Proportionality (expected civilian harm vs. concrete and direct military advantage).**
    - *Questions:* What was the commander's **ex ante** expectation? Was anticipated harm excessive relative to advantage?
    - *Data:* Weapon type/yield; collateral damage estimates (CDE) if disclosed; proximity to protected objects; modeled vs. observed effects; sensitivity analysis across plausible advantage assumptions.
    - *Method:* Report **ranges** and **confidence**; specify where only **ex post** inference is possible.
3. **Precautions in attack.**
    - *Questions:* Were feasible means taken to verify targets, choose less harmful weapons/tactics, and issue effective warnings?

- *Data:* Warning modalities (SMS, leaflets, calls, radio), lead time, corridor maps, de-confliction logs (e.g., hospitals, UN sites), weapon selection records, abort rates.
- *Symmetry:* For armed groups, assess placement of launchers/command nodes, tunnel openings, and **feasible** steps to reduce civilian exposure.

4. **Protection/Detention (humane treatment; hostages prohibited).**
    - *Questions:* Are detainees/POWs/hostages accounted for, treated humanely, reachable by neutral monitors, and allowed family contact? Are civilians unlawfully detained?
    - *Data:* Detainee rolls; charge sheets; access logs (e.g., ICRC); conditions (overcrowding, medical access); video/statement verification protocols.
5. **Prohibitions particularly relevant to urban war.**
    - **Human shields:** Intentional use of civilians to render points immune from attack.
    - **Perfidy:** Feigning protected status (ambulances, medical emblems).
    - **Starvation of civilians as a method of warfare:** Including siege practices that impede indispensable items.
    - **Indiscriminate weapons/attacks:** Munitions or methods incapable of being directed at specific military objectives.

Implementation practices

- **Triangulation:** Pair official communiqués with independent monitors and geo-verified OSINT; maintain a discrepancy log with reasons (access limits, definitional differences).
- **Event files:** For each incident above a severity threshold, create a structured record (time, place, actors, weapons, alleged rule, evidence, confidence, right of reply).
- **Comparator sets:** For judgments about "exceptionalism," compile matched cases (urban sieges, hostage crises, counter-insurgencies) and apply the **same codebook**.
- **Transparency:** Publish codebooks, category definitions (e.g., who counts as "affiliated fighter"), and inter-coder reliability.

7.2 Settlements, blockades, hostages, rockets: measurable claims

This subsection lists **domain-specific metrics** that move debates from symbol to specifics. Each category is framed in **paired** fashion so that findings apply across parties where relevant.

A. Settlements and land regime (West Bank, including East Jerusalem)

- **Inventory metrics**
    - Count **recognized settlements**, **outposts** (unauthorized/retroactively authorized), and **neighborhood expansions**; map by administrative status (state land, private claims, firing zones).
    - Annual approvals/starts/completions; demolition orders/executions (structures and people affected).
    - **Road network** segmentation (bypass roads, checkpoints) and average travel-time changes for Palestinians vs. Israelis.
- **Legal anchors**
    - Applicability of occupation law; transfer of civilian population; protection of property; due process in demolitions/evictions.
- **Outcome indicators**
    - Fragmentation indices (contiguity of Palestinian localities); permit approval rates; economic access (freight times, agriculture access days); violence incidents (by perpetrator type, response times).
- **Design notes**
    - Use **consistent spatial units** (grids or administrative areas) and publish shapefiles; separate **policy** (approvals) from **facts on the ground** (built area).

B. Blockades/closures and essential goods (notably Gaza; also local closures in WB)

- **Access & flow metrics**
    - Crossings: daily truck entries/exits; categories (food, fuel, medical, construction); rejection/return rates; crossing closures (duration, stated cause).
    - **Energy:** grid supply (MW), hours of electricity; fuel deliveries vs. demand; desalination output; hospital generator hours.
    - **Movement:** medical referral approvals/denials; patient/companion exit times; worker permits issued/revoked; fishing zone limits by date.

- **Humanitarian outcomes**
    - Water per capita/day; sewage overflow events; communicable disease incidence; malnutrition/food insecurity indicators (with methodology transparency).
    - Hospital occupancy, waitlists, and stockouts of essential medicines.
- **Legal anchors**
    - Proportionality of siege/closure measures; prohibition on starvation and collective punishment; obligations toward civilian population's essential needs.
- **Design notes**
    - Present **time-series** with policy-change markers (e.g., after specific attacks/ceasefires); distinguish **security-triggered** closures from routine regime; include **elasticity** analyses (how quickly humanitarian indicators respond to flow changes).

C. Hostages, detainees, and prisoners

- **Accounting**
    - Named lists; status categories (civilian, soldier, minor); location certainty; **date-stamped** proof-of-life; family contact cadence; third-party access (ICRC/others).
    - For state detention: charge vs. administrative detention; hearing dates; legal representation; conviction/acquittal rates; release conditions.
- **Treatment & violations**
    - Allegations of torture/ill-treatment (typology, site, timeframe); deaths in custody; enforced disappearance indicators; hostage-taking incidents and civilian shielding.
- **Exchange/negotiation metrics**
    - Truces correlated with releases; sequencing (women/children first); breach rates; verification mechanisms.
- **Legal anchors**
    - Absolute prohibitions (hostage-taking, torture); humane treatment; due process; special protections for children.

- **Design notes**
    - Maintain **chain-of-custody** for evidence; blur/facial-obscure sensitive media; log retractions/corrections visibly.

D. Rockets, mortars, missiles, and air/ground strikes

- **Attack characteristics**
    - Launch counts; types (homemade, standard rockets, guided missiles, mortars); **accuracy proxies** (CEP estimates, impact dispersion); launch-site proximity to protected objects.
    - For air/ground strikes: munition type/yield; fusing; guidance; aim point; **abort rates**; secondary explosion evidence.
- **Effect profiles**
    - Civilian vs. military casualties; infrastructure categories hit; shelter usage and siren activations; interception rates (where applicable).
    - **Indiscriminate patterns:** proportion of projectiles incapable of distinction; warning issuance and effectiveness.
- **Legal anchors**
    - Indiscriminate attacks; distinction and precautions; proportionality; human shields and perfidy (both sides where alleged).
- **Design notes**
    - Use **geospatial event mapping**; pair with building-damage assessment (BDA) from open imagery; disclose uncertainty bands for CEP and BDA attribution.

E. Rhetoric, incitement, and command responsibility (cross-cutting)

- **Content analysis**
    - Code official and militia statements for **dehumanization**, **direct/explicit incitement**, and **calls to unlawful aims**; track **command suppression** or **disciplinary actions** in response.
    - Time-lock rhetoric to subsequent conduct (event study) to test role of **projective identification**.

- **Legal anchors**
    - Prohibitions on incitement to genocide/violence; obligations to prevent/punish violations by subordinates.

F. Methods that bind the analysis to facts

- **Pre-registered codebooks** for each domain; publish inter-coder reliability.
- **Event studies** around symbolic triggers (holy days/sites, hostage proofs-of-life) to test **attention/behavior shifts**.
- **Matched-case comparisons** (e.g., siege episodes, urban assaults) to gauge whether Israel/Palestine exhibits **pattern deviations** after controlling for context.
- **Right of reply** protocol: share factual dossiers with implicated actors prior to publication; log responses.

Bottom line. These anchors make the argument **auditable**. They do not settle politics; they discipline it. By specifying what to measure and how, they let scholars and practitioners **cool archetypal heat** and **tighten accountability**—the necessary complement to any analysis of projection and Shadow.

8. Implications

The Shadow account should *change practice*. This section specifies what governments, platforms, universities, NGOs, and movements can *do* to reduce projection, keep scrutiny symmetrical, and generate data that disciplines debate.

8.1 Policy design: reducing projection incentives

Premise. Institutions can unwittingly *reward* archetypal heat (performative statements, symbolic sanctions, dramatic optics) while neglecting steady, law-bound levers. Design policies that lower the payoff to projection and raise the payoff to compliance.

A. Diplomatic/Statecraft levers

- **Standardized conditionality.** Publish a *single* IHL-based rubric (distinction, proportionality, detention standards, access for monitors) that governs *all* aid, arms, and recognition decisions across theaters. Include comparators to pre-commit against standard-shifting.

- **Trigger transparency.** For escalations or sanctions, issue a one-page trigger memo: the rule, evidence threshold, comparator cases, and sunset/renewal criteria. (Prevents mythic framing; encourages legal framing.)
- **Ritual insulation.** During sacred calendars and site-sensitive periods, pre-arrange *quiet channels* (ombuds + liaison teams) and freeze *symbolic* steps (flag moves, high-visibility visits) most susceptible to archetypal inflation.
- **Hostage/detainee architecture.** Standing humanitarian exchanges cell (neutral guarantors, verification protocols, family-contact SLAs) ready to deploy within 48 hours of crises—reduces role-induction dynamics.

B. Platform and media policy

- **De-inflation defaults.** Around sacred triggers, throttle algorithmic incentives for apocalyptic keywords and analogy inflation (Holocaust/Armageddon/etc.) unless paired with verified reporting.
- **Right-of-reply nudges.** When posts allege IHL breaches, surface a "request evidence package" prompt (time, coordinates, source, standard). Reward posts that comply with visibility boosts.
- **Comparator panels.** Newsrooms add a "paired case" sidebar policy: when framing an operation or siege, display two recent comparators with identical metrics. (Reduces exceptionalism drift.)

C. Bureaucratic design

- **Statement discipline.** Universities, medical boards, city councils: adopt a "competence rule"—issue statements only when (a) directly implicated, or (b) tying to the institution's remit *with actions*. Otherwise, route to teach-ins or resource hubs. (Lowers incentives for identity boundary work.)
- **Independent IHL monitors.** Fund *standing* mixed panels (Arabic/Hebrew/English expertise) that release *regularized* incident sheets, not surge reports—smoothing spike–decay cycles.

D. Metrics to track policy impact

- Spike amplitude in media/social coverage around sacred triggers; variance in sentiment volatility; time-to-ceasefire after hostilities; compliance events (access for monitors, detainee lists) following conditionality announcements.

8.2 Movement strategy: escaping purity spirals

Premise. Movements polarize fastest when archetypal heat rewards *belonging signals* over *outcomes*. Build cultures that preserve moral clarity *and* strategic flexibility.

A. Coalition hygiene

- **Symmetry pledge.** Public, pinned commitment to apply a *single* rights/IHL rubric to *all* parties (including one's own government). Make the rubric a shareable card used in campaigns.
- **Vocabulary charter.** Distinguish *legal* from *archetypal* language in all materials; ban apocalyptic diction in policy asks; permit it only in cultural work *labeled as such*.
- **Both/and discipline.** Adopt the "two-sentence rule": every statement names *two* harms or obligations that apply across sides (e.g., "Free the hostages; protect civilians under blockade/airstrikes"), then presents the concrete ask.

B. Decision procedures

- **Statement moratoriums.** 24–48 hour cooling-off before public statements after sacred-site incidents; internally collect facts, run the rubric, consult local partners.
- **Disagreement protocols.** Pre-commit to *process* (mediated caucus, evidence review window) before expulsion/denunciation. Publish the process—reduces performative shunning.
- **Action over signal.** Tie every post to an *action unit*: hotline, donation, legal brief, meeting ask, de-escalation training. (Shifts incentives from identity to impact.)

C. Messaging architecture

- **Laddered claims.** Separate *baseline claims* (IHL duties) from *contested claims* (root-cause frames). Lead with baselines in cross-ideological outreach; park contested frames for deep canvass contexts.
- **Analogy discipline.** Permit analogies only when (i) declared as analogies, (ii) paired with a comparator case, and (iii) accompanied by at least one *non*-analogous specific (dates, units, laws).

D. Training and care

- **De-inflation drills.** Role-play recognizing projection tells (certainty + heat + selective evidence) and pivoting to specifics.

- **Mutual-aid for dissenters.** Protect members who hold integrative positions from pile-ons; staff ombud roles.

E. Success indicators

- Coalition retention rates after crises; ratio of "action units" to "identity statements"; earned media that cites your *rubric* rather than your *rhetoric*; policy wins tied to symmetric demands.

8.3 Research agenda: metrics for projection and salience

Premise. To keep the Shadow lens falsifiable, build shared datasets and pre-registered methods that others can reuse and contest.

A. Salience and volatility

- **Spike–decay modeling.** Assemble daily series for coverage (front pages, prime-time minutes), social engagement, and legislative airtime for Israel/Palestine and matched conflicts. Fit Hawkes/ARIMA models; compare spike amplitude and half-life, with dummies for sacred-site/time events.
- **Agenda crowd-out.** Measure displacement of other international topics on UN agendas and national parliaments within ±7/14 days of triggers.

B. Projection and splitting indicators

- **Rhetoric mirror index.** NLP pipeline to detect accusation pairs (genocide, colonialism, terror, dehumanize) across antagonist corpora; compute lag and lexical overlap. Publish code and corpora snapshots.
- **Analogy inflation score.** Track frequency/placement of Holocaust/apartheid/Armageddon analogies; estimate causal impact on sentiment via instrumented designs (e.g., outlet policy changes).
- **Standard-shift coder.** Human-coded sample of official statements tagging invoked doctrines, evidentiary thresholds, and remedy calls; produce a *consistency delta* per speaker across theaters.

C. Projective identification (role induction)

- **Sequence analysis.** Event-study designs testing whether accusation bursts predict subsequent opponent behaviors (e.g., securitization moves, provocation optics) more

than baseline; incorporate instrumental variables (e.g., weather constraints, parliamentary calendars) to reduce endogeneity.

- **Field experiments.** RCTs on message frames (both/and vs. single-side; legal vs. archetypal) measuring openness to disconfirming evidence and sanction symmetry.

D. Legal–empirical integration

- **Incident files commons.** A shared, versioned repository of structured episodes (time, place, actors, weapons, alleged rule, evidence, confidence). Require right-of-reply logs and correction histories.
- **Comparator atlas.** Curated matched cases (urban sieges, hostage crises, occupation regimes) with harmonized metrics to test exceptionalism claims.

E. Data ethics

- **Harm review.** Red-team datasets for doxxing risks; blur faces; throttle geolocation precision near sensitive sites; consent protocols for testimonies.
- **Transparency & preregistration.** Pre-register hypotheses; publish codebooks and inter-coder reliability; maintain change logs.

F. Benchmarks of progress

- Replicable evidence that (i) sacred triggers systematically predict *excess* salience relative to harm baselines; (ii) mirror rhetoric has short lags and high lexical overlap; (iii) the same actors exhibit measurable *consistency deltas* across theaters—and that *interventions* (rubrics, statement discipline) reduce volatility and inconsistency.

Bottom line. Good policy cools archetypal heat by rewarding *specifics over symbols*; good movement strategy escapes purity spirals by tying identity to *standards and actions*; good research keeps the Shadow lens honest with *open, reusable* metrics.

References

Ahronheim, Anna, and Michael N. Schmitt, eds. 2020. *Israel's Targeted Killing Law: Legal and Policy Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Amnesty International. 2022. *Israel's Apartheid against Palestinians: Cruel System of Domination and Crime against Humanity*. London: Amnesty International.

Arendt, Hannah. 1963. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. New York: Viking.

B'Tselem. 2024. *Statistics on Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip Killed by Israeli Security Forces*. Jerusalem: B'Tselem.

Bakshy, Eytan, Solomon Messing, and Lada A. Adamic. 2015. "Exposure to Ideologically Diverse News and Opinion on Facebook." *Science* 348 (6239): 1130–32.

Bellingcat. 2021–. *Guides to Open-Source Verification and Geolocation*. The Hague: Bellingcat.

Bion, Wilfred R. 1961. *Experiences in Groups*. London: Tavistock.

Box, George E. P., and Gwilym M. Jenkins. 1970. *Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control*. San Francisco: Holden-Day.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2005. "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (1): 1–19.

Dayan, Daniel, and Elihu Katz. 1992. *Media Events: The Live Broadcasting of History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dinstein, Yoram. 2022. *The Conduct of Hostilities under the Law of International Armed Conflict*. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Entman, Robert M. 1993. "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm." *Journal of Communication* 43 (4): 51–58.

Galtung, Johan, and Mari Holmboe Ruge. 1965. "The Structure of Foreign News." *Journal of Peace Research* 2 (1): 64–91.

Girard, René. 1972. *Violence and the Sacred*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Girard, René. 1982. *The Scapegoat*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

ICRC (International Committee of the Red Cross). 2005–. *Customary International Humanitarian Law Database*. Geneva: ICRC.

ICRC. 2009. *Interpretive Guidance on the Notion of Direct Participation in Hostilities under IHL*. Geneva: ICRC.

ICRC. 2016. *Commentary on the First Geneva Convention*. Geneva: ICRC.

Jenkins, Henry. 2006. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: NYU Press.

Jewish Virtual Library. 2023. *Israel's Basic Laws*. Washington, DC: AICE.

Jung, C. G. 1951/1959. *Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*. Collected Works Vol. 9ii. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jung, C. G. 1959. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Collected Works Vol. 9i. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Khalidi, Rashid. 2020. *The Hundred Years' War on Palestine*. New York: Metropolitan.

Klein, Melanie. 1946. "Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms." *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 27: 99–110.

Levitt, Peggy, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2004. "Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective." *International Migration Review* 38 (3): 1002–39.

McCombs, Maxwell E., and Donald L. Shaw. 1972. "The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36 (2): 176–87.

McGoldrick, Dominic, and Emily Crawford, eds. 2023. *The Law of Non-International Armed Conflict*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Morris, Benny. 2004. *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Otto, Rudolf. 1917/1958. *The Idea of the Holy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Palestinian Centre for Human Rights (PCHR). 2023–. *Annual Reports*. Gaza City: PCHR.

Pappé, Ilan. 2006. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford: Oneworld.

Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. 1998. U.N. Doc. A/CONF.183/9.

Sassòli, Marco. 2019. *International Humanitarian Law: Rules, Controversies, and Solutions to Problems Arising in Warfare*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Schechtman, Yael, and Amichai Cohen. 2020. *Proportionality in Armed Conflicts: The Israel Experience*. Tel Aviv: INSS.

Scarry, Elaine. 1985. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shany, Yuval, and Amichai Cohen. 2024. “Urban Warfare, Precautions, and Proportionality.” *Israel Law Review* 57 (1): 1–35.

Sheffer, Gabriel. 2003. *Diaspora Politics: At Home Abroad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shlaim, Avi. 2014. *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World*. Updated ed. London: Penguin.

Turner, Victor. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Chicago: Aldine.

Tufekci, Zeynep. 2017. *Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

UN General Assembly. 1977. *Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions*. U.N. Treaty Series, Vol. 1125.

UN General Assembly. 1977. *Additional Protocol II to the Geneva Conventions*. U.N. Treaty Series, Vol. 1125.

UN OCHA (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs). 2007–. *oPt Humanitarian Dashboard and Data*. New York: OCHA.

U.S. Department of Defense. 2023. *Law of War Manual*. Updated ed. Washington, DC: DoD.

Vosoughi, Soroush, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. 2018. “The Spread of True and False News Online.” *Science* 359 (6380): 1146–51.

Weizman, Eyal. 2017. *Forensic Architecture: Violence at the Threshold of Detectability*. New York: Zone Books.

Yesh Din. 2020–. *Law Enforcement on Israeli Civilians in the West Bank: Data Sheets*. Tel Aviv: Yesh Din.

Yiftachel, Oren. 2006. *Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics in Israel/Palestine*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.